

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated March 25, 2011.

The Examiner rejected the remaining claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liaw, U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2004/01040985 as modified by Sekiya et al., U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0175907.

Liaw merely discloses using a lookup table to calculate an overdrive value for a current frame based on the driving value for a previous frame. Liow fails to disclose the limitation of “at least one predicted displayed luminance value of said pixel in respective ones of at least one frame subsequent to said current frame of said video image.” The Examiner appears to be relying upon the buffer storing the lookup table when reading this limitation of Liaw, but what is predicted using Liaw’s lookup table is the displayed luminance value for the current frame. See, e.g. Liaw at par. 0027. Using this information, the lookup table merely selects a driving value for the current frame that will best achieve the pixel value for the current frame, starting from the pixel value of the previous frame.

The Examiner asserts that Liaw discloses “overdriving a voltage . . . to a current value automatically selected . . . based upon (i) at least one predicted displayed luminance value of said pixel in at least one subsequent frame of said video image.” See Office Action at p. 3. The Examiner, however, leaves out a distinguishing limitation of the claims, i.e. that the predicted luminance value be for a frame “subsequent to *said current frame*” i.e. a frame subsequent to that for which the overdrive value is being calculated. Liaw does not disclose this, as the Examiner pretends that the term “subsequent” only requires that the predicted luminance value be for a frame subsequent to a frame preceding the frame for which an overdrive value is being calculated. Again, as the applicant has noted in a previous submission, claim 1 requires that the overdrive value calculated for a current frame be based on a luminance value of not only the frame preceding the current frame, but a frame subsequent to the current frame. The applicant has clarified this distinction by reciting the limitation of overdriving

a voltage to said portion to a current driving value for said current frame." This means that the subsequent limitation of basing the current driving value for the current frame on a predicted luminance value for a frame *subsequent to the current frame* cannot read on a Liaw's lookup table that merely correlates a selected driving value to the predicted luminance that would be achieved *in the current frame* were that driving value selected.

Claim 1 also recites the limitation of "where said current driving value is calculated to reach a non-equilibrium displayed luminance value in said current frame *used to predict* said at least one predicted displayed luminance value of said pixel in said at least one frame subsequent to said current frame." (Emphasis added.) The Examiner alleges that this limitation is disclosed by Sekiya. It is not. Instead, that reference merely discloses that the luminance value of the frame being driven may be at a non-equilibrium state at the end of the frame cycle; it does not disclose the circular or recursive nature of what is being claimed, i.e. basing a current overdrive value on a prediction of the luminance in a frame subsequent to the frame being driven, and basing the prediction on the non-equilibrium state reached by a selected driving value.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-4.

Applicant submits that no fees are required for entry of this Amendment. If any fees are deemed necessary, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite fee to Deposit Account No. 03-1550.

Respectfully submitted,

CHERNOFF, VILHAUER, McCLUNG & STENZEL

Dated: May 27, 2011

By


Kurt A. Rohlfs, Reg. No. 54,405
601 SW Second Ave., Suite 1600
Portland, OR 97204
Tel: (503) 227-5631